



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/442,150	11/18/1999	REINER KRAFT	AM9-99-0095	5474
21254	7590	04/07/2004	EXAMINER	
MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC 8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD SUITE 200 VIENNA, VA 22182-3817			PARTON, KEVIN S	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2153		
DATE MAILED: 04/07/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/442,150	KRAFT ET AL.
	Examiner Kevin Parton	Art Unit 2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 January 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-16 and 22-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 17-21 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 01/27/2004 regarding independent claims 22, 29, and 30 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Please see the following reasons and the associated grounds of rejection below.
2. The applicant argues "relative to claims 22, 29, and 30...nowhere does this description include any reference of written summary" (page 12, paragraph 2-3). Please note that in figure 5, each thumbnail is clearly accompanied by a filename. This is referred to in the previous rejection as the written summary. The claims do not specify the definition of the written summary, so any written description can be considered.
3. The applicant argues "There is no suggestion in Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) to extend any concepts therein to searches on the Internet" (page 11, paragraph 7). Please note that claims 22, 29, and 30 do not specify or even clearly suggest that the search must take place on the Internet.
4. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).
5. All further arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection below.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

8. Regarding claim 1, the following portions of the claim are unclear:

- a. Abstracts are generated from pointers without ever retrieving the document data;
- b. The origin of the stream of data that is displayed next to the smaller of the visual abstracts.

9. Regarding claim 10, the following portion is unclear: the origin of the stream of data that is displayed next to the smaller of the visual abstracts.

10. This rejection was previously pointed out in a non-final Office Action (paper #8), arguments were presented in applicant's response to that action (paper #12). These arguments were replied to by the Examiner and noted as not being persuasive in the subsequent Office Action (paper # 13). Accordingly, this rejection still stands as written below.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

11. Claims 17-21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

13. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192)

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention “by another,” or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

14. Regarding claim 10, Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) teach a system for processing search results obtained in response to a user query with means for:

- a. Examining document pointers returned by a search engine to identify a source from which documents are available, each document pointer including a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) (column 6, lines 20-28; figure 9).
- b. Obtaining the documents from the source (column 9, lines 63-67; figure 9).

- c. Generating a visual abstract for each of the documents, each visual abstract being a thumbnail image, each thumbnail image comprising a visual similarity of the document as reduced in size (column 9, lines 63-67; figure 9).
- d. Formatting a stream of data such that when the data is displayed on a display screen, each visual abstract appears adjacent to a corresponding search result (column 9, lines 63-67; figure 9).

15. Claims 22, 23, 29, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746).

16. Regarding claims 22 and 29, Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) teach a system for searching for a document with means for:

- a. Supplying a search request (column 11, lines 8-10).
- b. Providing abstracts of documents on a screen display that correspond to the search request, the abstracts including a written summary and a first visual abstract of each of the documents (figure 5; column 9, lines 23-26).
- c. Creating a second visual abstract of one of the documents, each of the first visual abstract and the second visual abstract respectively being a thumbnail image of the document, wherein the second visual abstract is larger than the first visual abstract (column 9, line 65 – column 10, line 6).
- d. Displaying the second visual abstract when requested by a user (column 9, line 65 – column 10, line 6).

17. Regarding claim 23, Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 22. They further teach means wherein the visual abstract is generated after first

Art Unit: 2153

manipulating the document so as to enhance a visibility of at least a portion of the document (column 9, line 65 – column 10, line 6).

18. Regarding claim 30, Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) teach a system for searching for a document comprising:

- a. A client (column 5, lines 23-27).
- b. A server (column 5, lines 23-27). Note that the storage can be external to the client.
- c. The client system supplying a search request to the server system, the server system providing abstracts to the client system, the abstracts corresponding to the search request, the client system displaying the abstracts on a screen display, the abstracts including a written abstract and a first visual abstract of each of the documents, the server system creating a second visual abstract of one of the documents, each of the first visual abstract and the second visual abstract respectively being a thumbnail image of the document, the second visual abstract being larger than the first visual abstract when displayed on the screen display, the client system displaying the second visual abstract when requested by a user (column 11, lines 8-16; column 9, lines 23-26; column 9, line 65 – column 10, line 6)

19. Regarding claim 31, Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 30. They further teach means wherein the visual abstract is created after manipulating a source document to enhance visibility of at least a first portion of the source document (column 9, line 65 – column 10, line 6).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

20. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

21. Claims 1-6, 11-13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) in view of Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746).

The applied reference (Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192)) has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

22. Regarding claim 1, Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) teach a system for processing search results obtained in response to a user query with means for:

- a. Providing document pointers returned by a search engine to identify a source from which documents are available, each document pointer including a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) (column 6, lines 20-28; figure 9).
- b. Generating a visual abstract for at least one of said documents, the visual abstract being a thumbnail image (column 9, lines 63-67; figure 9).
- c. Formatting a stream of data such that when said data is displayed on a display screen regarding said at least one of said documents, the visual abstract appears adjacent to a corresponding search result (column 9, lines 63-67; figure 9).

Although the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein at least two visual abstracts are generated for at least one of the documents, each of the visual abstracts being a thumbnail image of a different size.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192), as evidenced by Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746).

In an analogous art, Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) discloses a system for document retrieval wherein at least two visual abstracts are generated for at least one of the documents, each of the visual abstracts being a thumbnail image of a different size (column 9, line 65 –

Art Unit: 2153

column 10, line 6). Please note that according to the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary, 'document' is defined to include a graphic (page 156).

Given the teaching of Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) by employing multiple returned thumbnails of increasing size. This benefits the system by allowing a user to see a larger representation of a document that may be of use without having to retrieve the full document. It can save network or processing time.

23. Regarding claim 2, although the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) (as applied to claim 1) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein the visual abstract is generated after first manipulating the document so as to enhance a visibility of at least a portion of the document.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192), as evidenced by Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746).

In an analogous art, Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) discloses a system for document retrieval wherein the visual abstract is generated after first manipulating the document so as to enhance a visibility of at least a portion of the document (column 9, line 65 – column 10, line 6).

Given the teaching of Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) by employing the enhancement of at least portions of the document in generating the visual abstract. This benefits the system by allowing portions of the document to

be readable at a smaller size thus allowing the user to assess the applicability of the document based on certain key features.

24. Regarding claim 3, Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) teaches all the limitations as applied to claim 2. They further teach means wherein the manipulating is performed by filtering the document (column 10, lines 12-24).

25. Regarding claim 4, Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 3. They further teach means wherein the filtering is performed on an image in the document (column 10, lines 12-24).

26. Regarding claims 5 and 13, although the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) (as applied to claims 1 and 11, respectively) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means for displaying a larger one of the visual abstracts on the display screen when requested by the user.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192), as evidenced by Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746).

In an analogous art, Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) discloses a system for document search and retrieval with means for displaying a larger one of the visual abstracts on the display screen when requested by the user (column 9, line 65 – column 10, line 6).

Given the teaching of Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) by presenting the larger of the abstracts when requested by a user. This

benefits the system by allowing a user to have a larger number of the thumbnails on a single screen and only increasing the size one at a time.

27. Regarding claims 6 and 12, although the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) (as applied to claims 5 and 11, respectively) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose specifically means for storing data relating to the larger one of the visual abstracts.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192), as evidenced by Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746).

In an analogous art, Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) discloses a system for document search and retrieval with means for storing data relating to the larger one of the visual abstracts (column 9, line 65 – column 10, line 6). Note that image data is stored for all sizes of the thumbnail or visual abstract.

Given the teaching of Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) by employing the storage of larger visual abstracts. This benefits the system by allowing a larger abstract to be presented more quickly and it does not have to be generated each time it is requested by the user.

28. Regarding claim 11, although the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) (as applied to claim 10) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means for creating a larger visual abstract of at least one of the documents.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192), as evidenced by Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746).

In an analogous art, Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) discloses a system for document search and retrieval with means for creating a larger visual abstract of at least one of the documents (column 9, line 65 – column 10, line 6). Please note that according to the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary, ‘document’ is defined to include a graphic (page 156).

Given the teaching of Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) by employing multiple returned thumbnails of increasing size. This benefits the system by allowing a user to see a larger representation of a document that may be of use without having to retrieve the full document. It can save network or processing time.

29. Regarding claim 15, Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 13. They further teach means for removing the larger one of the visual abstracts from the display (column 9, lines 63-67; figure 9).

30. Claims 7-9, 14 and 16, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) in view of Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) as applied to claims 5 and 13 above and further in view of Yang et al. (USPN 6,301,586).

31. Regarding claims 7 and 14 although the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) and Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) (as applied to claims 5 and 13, respectively) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein the larger

one of the visual abstracts is displayed on the display screen when a cursor (pointing device) is moved over the smaller one of the visual abstracts.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) and Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746), as evidenced by Yang et al. (USPN 6,301,586).

In an analogous art, Yang et al. (USPN 6,301,586) discloses a system for search and retrieval of image information with means wherein the larger one of the visual abstracts is displayed on the display screen when a cursor (pointing device) is moved over the smaller one of the visual abstracts (column 22, lines 19-24; column 27, lines 5-10).

Given the teaching of Yang et al. (USPN 6,301,586), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying brown and Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) by employing the display of the larger abstract when the smaller one is “moused over”. This is very well known in the art and benefits the system by allowing the user to get a larger view of the data that may be of greater interest without downloading the file.

32. Regarding claim 8, Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 7. They further teach means for removing the larger one of the visual abstracts from the display screen (column 9, line 65 – column 10, line 6).

33. Regarding claims 9 and 16, although the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) and Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) (as applied to claims 8 and 15, respectively) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein the larger

one of the visual abstracts is removed from the display screen when the cursor (pointing device) is moved away from the smaller one of the visual abstracts.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) and Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746), as evidenced by Yang et al. (USPN 6,301,586).

In an analogous art, Yang et al. (USPN 6,301,586) discloses a system for search and retrieval of image information with means wherein the larger one of the visual abstracts is removed from the display screen when the cursor (pointing device) is moved away from the smaller one of the visual abstracts (column 22, lines 19-24; column 27, lines 5-10).

Given the teaching of Yang et al. (USPN 6,301,586), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Brown et al. (USPN 6,405,192) and Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) by employing the removal of the larger abstract when the smaller one is no longer “moused over”. This is very well known in the art and benefits the system by allowing the user to quickly free up screen space and move on to other thumbnails.

34. Claims 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746).

35. Regarding claim 27, Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 22. They further teach means for storing data relating to the second visual abstract (column 9, line 65 – column 10, line 6). Note that image data is stored for all sizes of the thumbnail or visual abstract.

Although the system disclosed by Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein the second abstract data is stored in a cache database.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746).

A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) by storing the larger abstracts in a cache database. This benefits the system by allowing the larger abstracts to be removed after a time if they are no longer needed thus saving valuable space and not storing redundant data. Cache storage is common in the art for any type of non-permanent data.

36. Regarding claim 28, although the system disclosed by Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) (as applied to claim 27) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose specifically means for deleting the data relating to the second visual abstract in the cache database after a predetermined amount of time.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746).

A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) by employing the disposal of the larger visual abstracts after a predetermined amount of time. Disposal of data from a cache after a predetermined amount of time is common in the art. It benefits the system by not using up valuable storage space on the larger visual abstracts that may not be needed permanently.

37. Claims 25, 26, 32, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) in view of Yang et al. (USPN 6,301,586).

38. Regarding claims 25 and 32, although the system disclosed by Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) (as applied to claims 22 and 30, respectively) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein the larger one of the visual abstracts is displayed on the display screen when a cursor (pointing device) is moved over the smaller one of the visual abstracts.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746), as evidenced by Yang et al. (USPN 6,301,586).

In an analogous art, Yang et al. (USPN 6,301,586) discloses a system for search and retrieval of image information with means wherein the larger one of the visual abstracts is displayed on the display screen when a cursor (pointing device) is moved over the smaller one of the visual abstracts (column 22, lines 19-24; column 27, lines 5-10).

Given the teaching of Yang et al. (USPN 6,301,586), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) by employing the display of the larger abstract when the smaller one is “moused over”. This is very well known in the art and benefits the system by allowing the user to get a larger view of the data that may be of greater interest without downloading the file.

39. Regarding claims 26 and 33, although the system disclosed by Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) (as applied to claims 25 and 32, respectively) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein the larger one of the visual abstracts is

removed from the display screen when the cursor (pointing device) is moved away from the smaller one of the visual abstracts.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746), as evidenced by Yang et al. (USPN 6,301,586).

In an analogous art, Yang et al. (USPN 6,301,586) discloses a system for search and retrieval of image information with means wherein the larger one of the visual abstracts is removed from the display screen when the cursor (pointing device) is moved away from the smaller one of the visual abstracts (column 22, lines 19-24; column 27, lines 5-10).

Given the teaching of Yang et al. (USPN 6,301,586), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) by employing the removal of the larger abstract when the smaller one is no longer "moused over". This is very well known in the art and benefits the system by allowing the user to quickly free up screen space and move on to other thumbnails.

40. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) in view of Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176).

41. Regarding claim 24, although the system disclosed by Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) (as applied to claims 23) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein the first portion of the source document to be enhanced corresponds to at least one of a title and a heading of the source document.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746), as evidenced by Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176).

In an analogous art, Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) discloses a system for displaying search results with means wherein the first portion of the source document to be enhanced corresponds to at least one of a title and a heading of the source document (figure 3).

Given the teaching of Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Enokida et al. (USPN 6,335,746) by employing the enhancement of the title of the document. This benefits the system by allowing the user to see the title as an identifier.

### *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Parton whose telephone number is (703)306-0543. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00AM - 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (703)305-4792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kevin Parton  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2153

ksp



CLINTON B. BURGESS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNICAL CENTER 2100